[22nd December 1922

(3) The same candidate presented a petition to the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Negapatam, at 10 p.m. on 8th August 1922 stating that his rival candidate Mr. Singaravelu Chettiyar with the help of the Chairman and a party of 200 fishermen of Negapatam were trying to cause a breach of the peace and requested bandobasth. The Circle Inspector found a crowd loitering in the streets in front of Mr. Singaravelu Chettiyar's house. The Circle Inspector, a Sergeant and the sub-inspectors of Negapatam and Nagore patrolled the town with their men armed on the night of the 8th and unarmed on the morning of the 9th August. There was no disturbance.

(4) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The rest of the question does not arise.

Caste distinction in hostels maintained by Government.

655 *Q.*—Mr. A. T. Palmer: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether caste distinction is observed in hostels maintained by the Government?

A.—Different classes of the community have different kitchens and dining rooms assigned to them. Otherwise there is no caste distinction.

Absence of district board presidents from India.

656 *Q.*—The Raja of Ramnad: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state why orders have not been passed with reference to the absence of the President of the Kistna District Board while on deputation in England in connexion with the Indian Students' Advisory Committee and whether the Government have declared that he forfeited his appointment by absence outside the local area under the provisions of the new Local Boards Act; whether the Government have declared or propose to declare that Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao forfeited his appointment and what the Government propose to do with regard to the absence on deputation to British Guiana of Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, who is the President of the District Board, Anantapur?

A.—The Government are advised that M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu Garu ceased to be a member and President of the District Board of Kistna by his absence from the meetings of that Board for more than three consecutive months. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai Avargal similarly ceased to be a member and President of the Anantapur District Board.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju:—"Has not Mr. Kesava Pillai taken charge of the district board presidentship, Anantapur, immediately after he returned from British Guiana?"

The hon. the Raja of Panagal:—"There was some doubt as to whether the condonation of his continuance as a member of the District Board, subsequent to his return from British Guiana, was valid. He took charge thinking that the condonation by the District Board was valid."

22nd December 1922]

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Has he been since gazetted as president of the District Board ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL : —" Yes."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU : —" When was it ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" It was notified in the last Gazette."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Is the Government going to validate all the acts done by him from the date of his taking charge to the date of his assumption of office under the Gazette notification ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" There is a provision in the Act under which the acts done by the president of the board are valid in such cases with retrospective effect."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" May I ask whether he will continue to be president for three years from the date of this nomination ? "

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Yes, from the date of this nomination."

The president of the Ramachandrapuram taluk board.

657 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state--

(*a*) whether the taluk board of Ramachandrapuram, Gōdāvari district, was accorded the privilege of electing its own president from among its members by G.O. No. 285, L. & M., dated 12th February 1921 ;

(*b*) whether the said taluk board elected one Mr. J. Ramachandra Rao as president, and that the Government in G.O. Mis. No. 1491, dated 1st August 1921, declared the said election invalid on the ground that the revenue divisional officer who was president of the taluk board on 1st April 1921, continued to be the president until the taluk board was reconstituted under rule 9 of Schedule X of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 ;

(*c*) the date on which the said taluk board was reconstituted under rule 9 of Schedule X of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 ;

(*d*) whether the president of the district board, Gōdāvari, fixed the 30th of June 1922 as the date for the election of the president of the taluk board of Ramachandrapuram and whether that date was postponed by him to the 29th of July 1922 and again to 29th of August 1922, and the reasons for these postponements ; and

(*e*) the reason for the continued postponement of the election of the president of the taluk board, Ramachandrapuram, which was sanctioned so long ago as 12th February 1921, and when this election is likely to take place ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*c*) The taluk board was reconstituted on the 5th May 1922.

(*d*) & (*e*) The President, District Board, Gōdāvari, fixed the 29th July 1922 as the date for the election of the president of the Ramachandrapuram Taluk Board. At that time the question of amalgamating the Ramachandrapuram and Peddapur Taluk Boards was under the consideration of Government. The President, District Board, Gōdāvari, was therefore asked to postpone the election of the taluk board president pending decision of the question of amalgamation.